Remarks

Claims 1-25 and 32-34 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 14, 16, 19, 22, 32 and 33 have been amended. Claims 2-3 have been canceled.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 7-12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 25, 32 and 34

These claims stand rejected based on the contention that they fail to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to specify that the oligoribonucleotides consist of from 21 to 23 nucleotides and comprises a contiguous sequence of SEQ ID NO:1 or a sequence which has one-base mismatch with SEQ ID NO:1. Thus, the pending claims do not encompass an inadequately described genus. (Support for this amendment is presented in various places in the specification, including in the sequence listing.) Furthermore, Applicants submit that a representative number of species of the claimed genus is presented. In connection with this, Applicant respectfully points out that the claimed invention is not solely defined by the particular sequences of which the oligoribonucleotides consist, but also as having the functional capacity to down-regulate the expression of the RI_{α} subunit of protein kinase A. Applicant notes that the limitations of claim 1 are also incorporated into each of claims 7-12, 15, 18, 21 and 24 that stand rejected under this heading. Thus, Applicants believe that all of these claims are supported by an adequate written description. In this regard, Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that SEQ ID NO:1 constitutes allowable subject matter. In respect of this indication it is noted that, in the response to the restriction requirement filed October 20, 2006, it was pointed out that Applicants believed election of SEQ ID NO:1 was an election of species (rather than an election of invention) and thus provisionally elected SEQ ID NO:1. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to now allow the additional oligoribonucleotide sequences recited in the claims.

Rejection of claims 15-25

These claims stand rejected based on the contention that they fail to comply with the enablement requirement.

In response, Applicants respectfully point out that the instant Example 12 and Figure 11 disclose that an antisense oligonucleotide having the sequence GCGUGCCUCCUCACUGGC in common with presently claimed SEQ ID NO:22 was shown to be effective in vivo in SCID mice against implanted human breast cancer cells. However, SEQ ID NO:22 is demonstrated in the present application to have even greater in vitro activity against cancer cell growth than the oligonucleotide with in vivo activity. Thus, since the present claims are drawn to oligoribonucleotides with greater in vitro activity than one of comparable length and sequence with known in vivo activity, one skilled in the art would expect that administration of the oligoribonucleotides of the present invention will provide for an effective arrest or inhibition of growth of cancer cells in vivo. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to remove the stated rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed all of the claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the rejections and allow all the claims.

Applicants request a one-month extension of time to file this response. A check for $60.00 is enclosed. If any additional fee is due it may be charged to Deposit Account no. 08-2442.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
John D. Lopinski, Reg. No. 50,486

HODGSON RUSS LLP
The Guaranty Building
140 Pearl Street, Suite 100
Buffalo, NY 14202-4040
Tel. 716-848-1430

Dated: April 16, 2007

011520/00338 BFLODOCS 1881974v1